1905.]

this case, however, the interest of the record lies in the fact that these specimens had been *bred* here and were taken from the larval gallery seven inches from the outside of the tree. This was testified by a piece of the wood which Mr. Dixon-Nuttall was good enough to send me displaying the galleries. A credible explanation of the origin of the progenitors of these specimens is afforded by the fact that some years ago new gate posts were put down in or near this farm, some of which were made of American ash. -W. E. SHARP, South Norwood : March 10th, 1905.

[The late Mr. P. B. Mason has recorded the capture of *N. erythrocephalus*, with another North American species, *N. caprea*, Say, at Burton-on-Trent, in an ash tree which had been brought from Carriek-on-Suir, Ireland. *cf.* Ent. Mo. Mag., vol. xxxiii, p. 91 (1897).—J. J. W].

Anisotoma furva, Er., at Skegness.—On Sept. 11th, 1904, at Skegness, Lines., by searching in the hollows on the sand-hills between 5 and 6 p.m. I took amongst a host of common beetles, 5 Anisotomas made up of one A. dubia, Kugel. (small var.), one A. ovalis, Schm., and three of the rare A. furva, Er. (two \mathcal{P} , one 3). They have been examined and the names kindly supplied by Mr. G. C. Champion.— E. W. MORSE, 9, Hill Top Mount, Roundhay Road, Leeds : March 15th, 1905.

Ptinus tectus, Boield.: Synonymic note.—This species was first introduced by Boieldieu in his "Monographie des Ptiniores" (Ann. Ent. Soc. Fr., 1854, 652). He gives P. pilosus, White (Voy. Ereb. Terr., 1846, xi, 8), as a synonym, and this synonymy has been reproduced in various catologues. The type of White's pilosus (which is labelled "pilosulus") is in the British Museum. Boieldieu's type is in the possession of M. Bedel, and he has been kind enough to carefully compare British specimens received from me with this type. Upon comparing these with White's pilosus, it is evident that there is not the slightest resemblance between them. White's insect is an elongate, parallel-sided insect, with close, decumbent, somewhat greenish-grey pubescence, and is from New Zealand. It is remarkable that in some points Boieldieu's description agrees better with White's insect than with my examples referred to above; indeed, the description is a bad one for what we now call Ptinus tectus, nor does it altogether accord with White's pilosulus.—E. A. NEWBERY, 12, Churchill Road, Dartmouth Park, N.W.: February 15th, 1905.

Diptera in the New Forest.—Mr. A. E. Gibbs, of St. Albans, has lately sent me for determination a number of *Diptera* collected for him by Mr. W. Brameld, of Brockenhurst. Among them are several species which may be worth mention as usually rare, though some of them are not uncommon in the New Forest. I cannot give the dates and localities, but all were taken in that district and almost all in 1904.

Of the Nematocera I would only mention Limnobia annulus, Mg. A fine and very local species, and Pedicia rivosa, L., not perhaps uncommon, but a large and very handsome insect.

Of the Brachycera—Atylotus fulvus, Mg., and Chrysops quadrata, Mg., seem to have been common in the Forest, as well as several other Tabanidæ. To these may be added the pretty Oxycera pulchella, Mg, the exotic looking Anthrax fenes-

I

tratus, Fln., and the strange little Oncodes gibbosus, L. The Syrphidæ were well represented, though mostly by common species; the following, however, are usually scarce, Melangyna quadrimaculata, Verr., Xanthogramma citrofasciatum, Deg., of this there was only one specimen, though there were several of the nucle commoner X. ornatum, Mg., Eristalis cryptarum, F., \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{Q} , Xylota lenta, Mg., and Chrysoloxum elegans, Lw.; this latter though usually scarce would seem to be not uncommon in the Forest.

The best Conopidæ were Conops vesicularis, L., \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{Q} , and C. ceriiformis Mg., the former used to be considered a great rarity, but is apparently not so now To these I would add Hypoderma? lineatum, Vill., probably common in the larva state, the two fine Tachinids, Echinomyia grossa, L., and Alophora hemiptera, F., neither of which seem scarce, Helomyza pectoralis, Lw., Phæomyia fuscipennis, Mg., Pteropæctria afflicta, Mg., and P. palustris, Mg., and last, but not least interesting, the rare Icterica westermanni, Mg., of which ten specimens were taken by sweeping rushes at Milford soon after harvest.

Mr. Andrews has kindly sent me a list of species from the New Forest, taken during the last and previous seasons. The following seem worthy of mention, besides those given in his note (Ent. Mo. Mag., March, 1905, p. 71), Xanthandrus comtus, Harr., Didea fasciata, Mcq., D. intermedia, Lw., Volucella inanis, L. (taken by Mr. Brameld), Mallota cimbiciformis, Fln., and Myiolepta luteola, Gmel.—E. N. BLOOMFIELD, Guestling: March, 1905.

Rhamphomyia tenuirostris, Fal., taken in the New Forest.-Among some Diptera recently received from Mr. Carter was a specimen of this species, taken in Arran, and on placing it in my cabinet I was surprised to find three specimens under this name, about which I had quite forgotten. On referring to my catalogue they proved to have been taken at Lyndhurst; two in September, 1900, and the other in September, 1901; and there is also a note showing that at the time I was doubtful as to the name being correct, as this species is not included in the British list. Mr. Grimshaw, in his "Diptera Scotica," records a single female taken at Glencorse, September 8th, 1898, and adds: "The only other British record of this species with which I am acquainted is that given by Col. Yerbury in the 'Irish Naturalist,' March, 1902,' where he mentions a specimen taken at Loo Bridge, in Ireland." Curtis, however, recorded it about the year 1825 from a female specimen taken in the Isle of Wight, so although it may not be often met with, it is evidently widely distributed. I am informed Mr. Griushaw considers the generic name, Macrostomus, Wied., has priority .- F. C. ADAMS, 50, Ashley Gardens, S.W.: March 2nd, 1905.

Dr. Reuter on the Urostylinæ.—In his interesting remarks on this subfamily of the Pentatomidæ (ante, p. 64), Dr. Reuter—who follows Dallas in considering that the Urostylinæ constitute a distinct family—has made some reference to my first volume on the Rhynchota of British India, which may perhaps create a wrong impression. His remarks may be taken to suggest that I have not noticed his genus Eurhynchiocoris, which he described in 1881. This, however, is not the case; at the foot of my Synopsis of the genera I have added the following note:—"The